1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 RICHARD L. ALLEY, No. CIV-S-04-1934 MCE/PAN P 11 12 Petitioner, 13 ORDER v. TOM L. CAREY, 14 15 Respondent. 16 17 October 17, 2005, the court dismissed this action upon the ground petitioner's default of a state procedure bars federal 18 19 review of the petition and the clerk of the court duly entered 20 judgment. Petitioner seeks relief from judgment. 21 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b): 22 On motion and upon such terms as are just, the court may relieve a party or a party's legal representative from a final judgment, order or proceeding for the 23 following reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, 2.4 or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered in 25 time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); 26 ///

## Case 2:04-cv-01934-MCE-PAN Document 22 Filed 11/03/05 Page 2 of 2

(3) fraud (whether heretofore denominated intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an adverse party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released or discharged, or a prior judgment upon which it is based has been reversed or otherwise vacated, or it is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application; or (6) any other reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment.

MORRISON C. ENGL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Petitioner does not demonstrate he is entitled to relief from judgment.

Accordingly, petitioner's October 25, 2005, motion is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: November 2, 2005